



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,148	11/01/2000	Geetha Ravishankar	CISCP669	4572

26541 7590 06/03/2005

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN
P.O. BOX 2448
SARATOGA, CA 95070

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,148

Applicant(s)

RAVISHANKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 11/17/2004. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

2. The rejection under 112, second paragraph is withdrawn based on amendment filed on 11/17/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byrne et al. (US 6,708,170) hereinafter Byrne, in view of Caldwell et al. (2002/0046286), hereinafter Caldwell.

5. As to claim 19, Byrne discloses the invention as claimed including a system for integrating a network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with different directory servers (col. 1, lines 16-26), the system comprising:

a table mapping attributes utilized by the network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with attribute names used by the directory servers available to the application (col. 6, lines 21-24 and 28-31);

means for searching (i.e., query) the directory server for the requested attribute with the identified directory server attribute name (col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59; col. 12, lines 15-20).

6. Byrne discloses means for identifying in the table the attribute name (col. 2, lines 5-10 and 62-67; col. 6, lines 15-28). However, Byrne does not specifically disclose identifying the attribute name used by one of the directory servers corresponding to an attribute requested by the application. Caldwell discloses identifying the attribute name used by one of the directory servers corresponding to an attribute requested by the application (page 6, [0075]; page 7, [0077]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Caldwell because Caldwell's identifying the attribute name used by a server would allow keep tracking which attributes was retrieved by which server.

7. As to claim 21, Byrne discloses the application is a unified communication application (col. 7, lines 61-67).

8. As to claim 22, Byrne discloses searching the directory server includes using LDAP (i.e., LDAP search request; col. 1, lines 36-39; col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).

9. As to claim 14, Byrne discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a system for integrating a network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with different directory servers (col. 1, lines 16-26), the system comprising:

a table mapping attributes utilized by the network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with attribute names used by the directory servers (col. 6, lines 21-24 and 28-31);

memory (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47) that at least temporarily stores the table (i.e., storing the table in the cache; col. 5, lines 49-51; col. 6, lines 28-31); and

a processor (i.e., processor; 202, fig. 2; col. 4, lines 17-20 and 37-43) that identifies in the table the directory server attribute name corresponding to an attribute requested by the application (i.e., identifying the directory server which stores the corresponding to the requested attribute; col. 2, lines 5-10 and 62-67; col. 12, lines 15-20).

10. Byrne discloses a directory server having the mapping table can send a request (i.e., query, 420, fig. 4A) to other directory servers (col. 6, lines 14-23). However, Byrne does not specifically disclose sending a request containing the identified directory server attribute name to the corresponding directory server. Caldwell discloses sending a request containing the identified directory server attribute name to the corresponding directory server (page 9, [0092]; page 11, [0100]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Caldwell because Caldwell's sending the request containing the identified

server attribute name would allow configuring the requested data type.

11. As to claim 15, Byrne discloses the application is a unified communication application (col. 7, lines 61-67).

12. As to claim 16, Byrne discloses the processor is configured to send the request to an LDAP server (col. 2, lines 5-9).

13. As to claim 17, Byrne discloses the application is configured to communicate with a message server (i.e., email server; col. 1, lines 36-39).

14. As to claim 18, Byrne and Caldwell do not specifically disclose the application is configured for communicating with a SNPP API. However, Caldwell discloses the communication protocol (page 8, [0088]) and communication interface unit (page 5, [0049]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Caldwell because Caldwell's communication protocol would allow the user to send wireless message to a pager or cellular phone via wireless network.

15. As to claim 1, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 14 and 19 above. In addition, Byrne discloses receiving information in response to the request (i.e., responses, 422, fig. 4A; col. 6, lines 19-20).

16. As to claim 2, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 15 above.
17. As to claim 3, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 16 above.
18. As to claim 4, Byrne discloses the number of different directory servers is greater than two (i.e., Server1-Server3; fig. 4).
19. As to claim 5, Byrne discloses running an IP based software (i.e., IP; col. 1, lines 40-42; col. 3, lines 60-62; col. 10, lines 8-10).
20. As to claim 6, Byrne discloses sending a search request (col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).
21. As to claim 7, Byrne discloses sending a messaging request (i.e., email or written query; col. 1, lines 36-39; col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).
22. As to claims 8 and 9, Byrne discloses loading the table into memory when the application is run (i.e., storing the table in the cache; col. 5, lines 49-51; col. 6, lines 28-31).
23. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 14 above. In addition, Byrne discloses computer program product (i.e., program instruction; col. 4,

lines 11-14 and 43-47); code that receives information in response to the request (i.e., responses, 422, fig. 4A; col. 6, lines 19-20); and a computer readable medium that stores the computer codes (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47; col. 12, lines 59-67).

24. As to claims 11 and 12, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 8 and 9 above.

25. As to claim 13, Byrne discloses the computer readable medium is selected from the group consisting of CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47).

26. As to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 10 above.

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

28. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that:

- (1) Byrne et al. do not disclose a system for integrating a network application with different directory servers.
- (2) Byrne et al. do not address the issue of directory servers having different application schema.

29. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remark.

As to point (1), in response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "a system for integrating a network application with different directory servers" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

As to point (2), In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., directory servers having different application schema) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Although claim 1 recites "each server having a different schema" in the preamble, the meaning of the two terms "different schema" and "different application schema" are slightly different. Moreover, all other independent claims 10, 14 and 19 are not recited the feature.

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2154

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWC
May 27, 2005


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100